UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,627	12/28/2000	Surendra Goel	06975-147001/ Search 03	5980

26171 7590 03/14/2005	EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. 11TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500	BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/749,627	GOEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April L Baugh	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 December 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1/19/05, 12/3/04, 8/26/04, 6/16/04_
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

`DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by US

Patent 6,370,527 to Singhal.

Regarding claim 1, Singhal teaches a method for displaying web site search results

obtained from searching multiple electronic information stores without distinguishing the

particular electronic information stores in the display, the method comprising: a web host

receiving at least one search term (column 3, lines 46-53); the web host comparing the search

term with first electronic information within a first electronic information store to determine

whether matches exist, the first electronic information including content provided by an internal

source; the web host comparing the search term with second electronic information within a

second electronic information store to determine whether matches exist, the second electronic

information including content provided by an external source (abstract and column 1, lines 34-

41); and displaying results based on the matches that are determined to exist with the first

electronic information and the second electronic information, wherein the results are combined

in a single list of results comprised of the matches that are determined to exist with the first

electronic information and the second electronic information (column 2, lines 17-28 and column 4, lines 45-57).

Regarding claim 8, Singhal teaches searching multiple electronic information stores, the method comprising: a method for displaying web site search results that are produced from a web host receiving at least one search term (column 3, lines 46-53); the web host comparing the search term with first electronic information within a first electronic information store to produce first results based on matches that are determined to exist; the web host sending the search term to a third party search service for use in comparing the search term to at least second electronic information within a second electronic information store to produce second results based on matches that are determined to exist (abstract and column 1, lines 34-41); the web host receiving the second results from the third party search service; the web host combining the first results and the second results; and displaying the combined first results and second results as a single list of results, the results including at least one web site identifier (column 2, lines 17-28 and column 4, lines 45-57 and fig. 7).

Regarding claim 17, Singhal teaches a computer program stored on a computer readable medium for displaying web site search results obtained from searching multiple electronic information stores transparently without distinguishing the particular electronic information store, comprising instructions for: receiving at least one search term (column 3, lines 46-53); comparing the search term with first electronic information within a first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist, wherein the first electronic information includes content provided by all internal source; comparing the search term with second electronic information within a second electronic information store to determine whether matches exist,

wherein the second electronic information includes content provided by an external source

(abstract and column 1, lines 34-41); and displaying results based on the matches that are

determined to exist with the first electronic information and the second electronic information,

wherein the results are combined in a single list of results comprised of the matches that are

determined to exist with the first electronic information and the second electronic information

(column 2, lines 17-28 and column 4, lines 45-57).

Regarding claim 3, Singhal teaches the method of claim 1 wherein: receiving at least one

search term comprises receiving several search terms and grouping the search terms received as a

single string (column 5, lines 40-42 and column 6, lines 30-37 and 54-61); comparing the search

term with the first electronic information comprises comparing the single string of search terms

with the first electronic information to determine whether matches exist; and comparing the

search term with the second electronic information comprises comparing the single string of

search terms with the second electronic information to determine whether matches exist (abstract

and column 1, lines 34-41).

Regarding claim 4 and 12, Singhal teaches the method of claim 1 and 8wherein the first

electronic information further includes proprietary web content such that comparing the search

term with the first electronic information includes comparing the search term with the propriety

web content within the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist

(abstract and column 1, lines 34-41 and column 5, lines 4-7 and column 6, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 5 and 13, Singhal teaches the method of claim 4 and 12 wherein the

second electronic information further includes non-proprietary web content such that comparing

the search term with the second electronic information includes comparing the search term with

the non-proprietary web content within the second electronic information store to determine

whether matches exist (abstract and column 1, lines 34-41 and column 5, lines 4-7 and column 6,

lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 6 and 16, Singhal teaches the method of claim 1 and 8 wherein the

results include a ranked list of web site identifiers (column 4, lines 45-57 and fig.7).

Regarding claim 7, Singhal teaches the method of claim 6 wherein the results from the

matches determined to exist with the internal source are ranked higher than the results from the

matches determined to exist with the external source (column 1, lines 42-49 and column 5, lines

4-7 and column 6, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 10, Singhal teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the second

electronic information within the second electronic information store is maintained by the third

party search service (column 1, lines 17-27 and column 3, lines 5-11 and fig.1).

Regarding claim 11, Singhal teaches the method of claim 8 wherein combining the first

results and the second results includes integrating the first results and the second results without

displacing (column 1, lines 34-41).

Regarding claim 12, Singhal teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the first electronic

information includes proprietary information (abstract and column 1, lines 34-41 and column 5,

lines 4-7 and column 6, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 13, Singhal teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the second

electronic information includes information that is non-proprietary to a provider of the first

electronic information (abstract and column 1, lines 34-41 and column 5, lines 4-7 and column 6,

lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 14, Singhal teaches the method of claim 13 wherein the second

electronic information includes information that is proprietary to the third party search service

(abstract and column 1, lines 34-41 and column 5, lines 4-7 and column 6, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 15, Singhal teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the first electronic

information within the first electronic information store is maintained by an internet service

provider (column 3, lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 18, Singhal teaches the computer program of claim 17 wherein the

computer readable medium comprises a propagated signal (column 2, lines 63-65 and column 3,

lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 19, Singhal teaches the computer program of claim 18 wherein the

propagated signal comprises a carrier wave (column 2, lines 63-65 and column 3, lines 5-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2, 9, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

6,370,527 to Singhal in view of Navin-Chandra et al. (US 6,275,820)

Regarding claims 2, 9, and 20, Singhal teaches the method of claim 1, 8, and 17 (abstract

and column 1, line 34-49).

Singhal does not teach displaying results such that whether the results are obtained from the external source or the internal source is transparent to a user viewing the single list of results. Navin-Chandra et al. teaches wherein displaying results includes displaying results such that whether the results are obtained from the external source or the internal source is transparent to a user viewing the single list of results (abstract and column 8, lines 16-18). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus for searching networks using a plurality of search engines of Singhal by displaying results such that whether the results are obtained from the external source or the internal source is transparent to a user viewing the single list of results because this returns a more uniform and accurate ranking of results in response to the users query.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to displaying search results in general: Corey et al., Holt et al., Spencer, Fox et al., Smith, Sugiura et al., Dutta, Egendorf et al., Snyder.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 571-272-3877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER